

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

RASHAUN ROUNDTREE,

Plaintiff,

-against-

ORANGE COUNTY; ORANGE COUNTY  
JAIL,

Defendants.

22-CV-1697 (CS)

ORDER OF SERVICE

CATHY SEIBEL, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff, who is currently incarcerated at Wallkill Correctional Facility, brings this *pro se* action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that Defendants violated his constitutional rights during his 2019 detention in the Orange County Jail. By order dated March 25, 2022, the Court granted Plaintiff's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"), that is, without prepayment of fees.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

The Court must dismiss a complaint, or portion thereof, that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B), 1915A(b); *see Abbas v. Dixon*, 480 F.3d 636, 639 (2d Cir. 2007). The Court must also dismiss a complaint when the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). While the law mandates dismissal on any of these grounds, the Court is obliged to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally, *Harris v. Mills*, 572 F.3d 66, 72 (2d Cir. 2009), and interpret them to raise the "strongest [claims] that they suggest," *Triestman v. Fed. Bureau of Prisons*, 470 F.3d 471, 474 (2d Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted) (emphasis in original).

## DISCUSSION

### A. Orange County Jail

As previously explained to Plaintiff, his claims against the Orange County Jail must be dismissed. Section 1983 provides that an action may be maintained against a “person” who has deprived another of rights under the “Constitution and Laws.” 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Orange County Jail is not a “person” within the meaning of Section 1983. *See Will v. Mich. Dep’t of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58 (1989) (state is not a “person” for the purpose of § 1983 claims); *Zuckerman v. Appellate Div., Second Dep’t Supreme Court*, 421 F.2d 625, 626 (2d Cir. 1970) (court not a “person” within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 1983); *Whitley v. Westchester Cnty. Corr. Fac. Admin.*, No. 97-CV-420 (SS), 1997 WL 659100, at \*7 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 22, 1997) (correctional facility or jail not a “person” within the meaning of Section 1983). The Court therefore dismisses Plaintiff’s claims against the Orange County Jail. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

### B. Orange County

Because Plaintiff has been granted permission to proceed IFP, he is entitled to rely on the Court and the U.S. Marshals Service to effect service.<sup>1</sup> *Walker v. Schult*, 717 F.3d. 119, 123 n.6 (2d Cir. 2013); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) (“The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process . . . in [IFP] cases.”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3) (the court must order the Marshals Service to serve if the plaintiff is authorized to proceed IFP)).

---

<sup>1</sup> Although Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure generally requires that a summons be served within 90 days of the date the complaint is filed, Plaintiff is proceeding IFP and could not have served the summons and the complaint until the Court reviewed the complaint and ordered that the summons be issued. The Court therefore extends the time to serve until 90 days after the date the summons is issued.

To allow Plaintiff to effect service on Defendant Orange County through the U.S. Marshals Service, the Clerk of Court is instructed to fill out a U.S. Marshals Service Process Receipt and Return form (“USM-285 form”) for this Defendant. The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issue a summons and deliver to the Marshals Service all the paperwork necessary for the Marshals Service to effect service upon this Defendant.

If the complaint is not served within 90 days after the date the summons is issued, Plaintiff should request an extension of time for service. *See Meilleur v. Strong*, 682 F.3d 56, 63 (2d Cir. 2012) (holding that it is the plaintiff’s responsibility to request an extension of time for service).

Plaintiff must notify the Court in writing if his address changes, and the Court may dismiss the action if Plaintiff fails to do so.

**C. Rule 21 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure**

Plaintiff asserts that, while he was detained in the Orange County Jail, a Jane Doe medical administrative provider and a head nurse were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs. The Clerk of Court is directed, under Rule 21 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to amend the caption of this action to add “Jane Doe 1-2,” as Defendants. This amendment is without prejudice to any defenses that these Defendants may wish to assert.

**D. Jane Doe defendants**

Under *Valentin v. Dinkins*, a *pro se* litigant is entitled to assistance from the district court in identifying a defendant. 121 F.3d 72, 76 (2d Cir. 1997). In the complaint, Plaintiff may have supplied sufficient information to permit the Orange County Department of Corrections to identify the Jane Does who provided medical treatment to Plaintiff, or failed to do so, between August 15, 2019, and August 26, 2019. It is therefore ordered that the County Attorney for

Orange County, who is the attorney for and agent of the Orange County Department of Corrections, must ascertain the identity of each Jane Doe whom Plaintiff seeks to sue here and the addresses where these defendants may be served. The Orange County Attorney must provide this information to Plaintiff and the Court within sixty days of the date of this order.

Within thirty days of receiving this information, Plaintiff must file an amended complaint naming the Jane Doe defendants. The amended complaint will replace, not supplement, the original complaint. An amended complaint form that Plaintiff should complete is attached to this order. Once Plaintiff has filed an amended complaint, the Court will screen the amended complaint and, if necessary, issue an order directing the Clerk of Court to complete the USM-285 forms with the addresses for the named Jane Doe defendants and deliver all documents necessary to effect service to the U.S. Marshals Service.


### **CONCLUSION**

The Clerk of Court is directed to: (1) dismiss the Orange County Jail from the case; (2) amend the caption of this action to add “Jane Doe 1-2” as Defendants; (3) complete the USM-285 forms with the address for Orange County and deliver all documents necessary to effect service to the U.S. Marshals Service; (4) mail a copy of this order and the complaint to the County Attorney for the County of Orange at: 255-275 Main Street, Goshen, New York 10924; and (5) mail an information package to Plaintiff.

The Court certifies under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore IFP status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *Cf. Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962) (holding that an appellant demonstrates good faith when he seeks review of a nonfrivolous issue).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 17, 2022  
White Plains, New York

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CATHY SEIBEL  
United States District Judge

**DEFENDANT AND SERVICE ADDRESS**

Orange County  
Office of the Orange County Attorney  
Orange County Government Center  
255 Main Street  
Goshen, NY 10924